

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, and 9-23 remain pending in this application. Applicants acknowledge and appreciate the Examiner's express withdrawal of the rejections made in the previous Office Action.

Claims 1-3, 5, 6 and 9-23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishimura et al. (EP0304503) in view of Kihara et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,936,011). The teachings of Ishimura et al. have been discussed in the last two Office Actions and in Applicants' previous reply. It has been argued, and the Office acknowledged, that Ishimura et al. does not teach that the epoxy resin used to react with the amine curing agent has a chlorine content of not more than 400 ppm. In fact, Ishimura et al. teaches that there is "no particular restriction on the choice of epoxy resins" for the present invention so far as they have on the average at least two epoxy groups in the molecule. See page 8, lines 23 and 24.

Recognizing this deficiency in the teachings of Ishimura et al., the Office has relied on Kihara et al. as allegedly teaching an epoxy curing agent (col. 1, lines 5-10) comprising the reaction product of an amine and an epoxy (example 1) with a total chlorine content in the epoxy of 390 ppm (production example 1). However, the Office apparently failed to recognize that the chlorine content of the ingredient addressed by Kihara et al. in Preparation Example 1 (paragraph bridges columns 8 and 9) is NOT for the same component recited in claim 1. Please note that the total chlorine content addressed in Preparation Example 1 relates to the modified polyamine corresponding

to amine curing agent (A) of the claimed invention, NOT to the total amount of chlorines in epoxy resin (D) as recited in the present claims.

Kihara et al. is concerned about limiting the chlorine content of the modified polyamine to 1,000 ppm or below corresponding to the amine curing agent (A) in the claimed invention, and does not address or suggest any limitation regarding the epoxy resin component (D) of the claimed invention or the epoxy resin arguably taught by Ishimura et al.. Not only does Kihara et al.. not teach or suggest any limitation regarding chlorine content of the recited epoxy resin (D), Kihara et al.. is concerned with entirely different properties than the claimed invention. Kihara et al.. is concerned with imparting water resistance to the cured product (See col. 2, lines 7-17 and col 13, lines 4-11). In contrast, the present invention seeks to improve storage stability and electrical characteristics (*see e.g.*, page 30, line 15 to page 31, line 18).

Neither Ishimura et al., nor Kihara et al., alone or in combination, provides a reasonable basis for a prima facie case of obviousness. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-3, 5-6, and 9-23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Ishimura in view of Yamada. These rejections should be withdrawn because Yamada does not provide an "epoxy resin in which a total amount of chlorines in the epoxy resin is not more than 400 ppm". *See* Claim 1. Accordingly, a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicants' invention could not have arrived at Applicants' claims by combining the Ishimura

disclosure with the Kihara et al. disclosure. Prompt and favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully regarded.

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to Deposit Account No. 06-0916. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: July 10, 2009

By: Charles E Van Horn
Charles E. Van Horn
Reg. No. 40,266
(202) 408-4000